

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



1, 1985

against terrorists." We and the Kingdom view this Supplementary Convention without reservation, but it will also be consistent with the rules established limits on the political offense exception virtually identical to those contained in this Supplementary Convention. The United Kingdom is a party to Convention without reservation, but it is solely to members of the Council of Europe and we are only an observer there. Nevertheless, in our search for a solution to the problems created by current application of the political offense exception in our courts, we looked to that Convention and concluded that its limitations were appropriate.

Chairman, I respectfully request that your Committee report on this treaty as a timely matter and that you recommend to the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification. I appreciate this opportunity to testify and will be pleased to answer any questions.

#### PROTECTING ANIMALS AGAINST INHUMANE TREATMENT

Mr. CHAFFEE. Mr. President, the treatment of animals used in laboratory experiments is by no means a new issue. It has, however, recently come to the forefront of public attention in the wake of disturbing revelations about the abuses at the University of Pennsylvania Head Injury Clinic. I am pleased that the National Institutes of Health has responded to public concern by suspending funding for this clinic until a full investigation can be completed.

Abuses at the University of Pennsylvania are merely the most recent and visible example of a continuing problem. Current standards leave too much room for shoddy care and inhumane treatment.

Congress now has before it new legislation designed to tighten these standards. S. 1233, introduced in the Senate by Senator DOLE, and H.R. 533, introduced in the House by Representative BROWN, would go a long way toward insuring that lab animals are properly cared for and humanely treated.

These bills represent a reasonable approach to a difficult problem. Certainly many research projects which have greatly benefited mankind might not have been conducted without some use of animals. While it is important for such efforts to continue, we most certainly should not condone the inhumane treatment of animals nor should we undertake experiments which sacrifice the lives of animals unnecessarily.

As a cosponsor of Senator DOLE's bill, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. It would

minimize the use of animals by directing researchers to consider alternatives. A new national information service would assist them in finding such alternatives, and would prevent unintended duplication of research. In those cases which require the use of animals, researchers would be directed to seek the least painful methods, and to use pain-relieving drugs and anesthesia to minimize the animals' distress.

Mr. President, until we can develop alternative methodologies, we will need to continue some use of animals in research. These projects have resulted in medical and scientific breakthroughs that have touched all of our lives, and have saved millions of others. But we can—and should—ensure that strict standards are in place to protect the subjects of such experiments.

This legislation represents a reasonable balance between the public's concern over the treatment of animals and the need to continue research which benefits us all. I believe its enactment will be a significant step toward a resolution of this continuing controversy.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to direct my colleagues' attention to an editorial on this subject which appeared in yesterday's edition of the New York Times. It points out the need for this type of legislation, adding that the bills before us are endorsed by the American Physiological Society, the largest user of lab animals. I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(From the New York Times, July 31, 1985)

#### CRUELTY TO RESEARCH ANIMALS

Medical research would be impossible without experiments on animals, and most researchers treat them well, not least because badly kept animals make poor subjects. But there are distressing exceptions. Recently, the National Institutes of Health cut off funds for a University of Pennsylvania laboratory after a preliminary finding that the lab failed to treat animals humanely.

Experimentation on animals rouses strong public feeling, particularly when cats or dogs are concerned. Extremist animal rights groups have recently taken to raiding laboratories and turning animals loose. In May 1984 a group stole videotapes of experiments from the Head Injury Research Laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania. Another group, People for Ethical Treatment of Animals, has distributed excerpts of the tapes that seem to show baboons suffering from insufficient anesthesia and non-sterile surgery.

Animal rights advocates not long ago staged a sit-in at the National Institutes of Health protesting the Pennsylvania experiments. The demonstration ended when Margaret Heckler, Secretary of Health and Human Services, ordered the N.I.H. to suspend its funding.

Does the standard of animal care by researchers need improvement? Scientists currently observe voluntary codes. Their institutions have in-house committees that monitor animal research, and are subject to Department of Agriculture inspections. This light-handed control would be ideal if it worked. It doesn't. Painful experiments aside, Agriculture's veterinary inspectors regularly find violations of minimum standards of care. According to inspectors' reports analyzed by the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 24 percent of one sample of research institutions were found to have major, repeated violations; 22 percent had some major violations, 29 percent had minor violations and only 24 percent were in compliance.

A bill to improve the system has been introduced by Bob Dole in the Senate and George Brown in the House. It would require researchers to minimize pain by all reasonable steps that do not frustrate the experiment. Institutions' animal care committees would have to include a veterinarian and a concerned public member. Researchers would have to consult a veterinarian in planning any painful experiment.

This moderate bill is supported by the American Physiological Society, the largest user of research animals. It believes the bill would impose no hardship on its members and would not impede research. Raising the standards of animal care, and catching offenders who have fallen into callousness, has intrinsic value. It is also necessary to preserve public support against those who oppose all use of animals in research.

#### NORTHERN VIRGINIA COMMUNITY FOUNDATION'S FOUNDER'S AWARD

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of the recipient of the Virginia Community Foundation's Founder's Award, John M. Toups, businessman and resident of McLean, VA.

Northern Virginia community leaders will present the award on September 7, 1985.

In publicly recognizing an individual who has made an unusual leadership contribution to the northern Virginia community, the foundation seeks to promote awareness of the significance of individual action in improving the quality of life for all members of the community.

The Northern Virginia Foundation was formed in 1978 by a group of residents who wanted "to return to the community some of the riches that they had received from it."

Five areas of concern benefit from the foundation's endowment funds: The arts, education, health, youth, and civic improvement.

The foundation receives charitable gifts from people from all walks of life at all income levels—families, businesses, national corporations, and foundations.

Donations are used exclusively to benefit northern Virginia.

The foundation has selected John M. Toups, chairman, president, and chief executive officer of Planning Re-

